

Remarks

Claims 9-16 remain pending in the above-referenced application and are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

As requested by the Examiner, copies of the Form 1449 of March 8, 2002 and of July 22, 2002 are submitted herewith. Consideration of the art cited therein is respectfully requested.

Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as indefinite. Claims 15 and 16 have been amended in order to provide antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by French Patent Application No. FR 75 24147 to Henry et al. ("Henry").

Claim 16, as amended, recites that "the first layer, the second layer, and the third layer are diced into individual chips so that, in an internal area, each of the chips has at least one depression" and that "the depression in an internal area is sawed and none of the first layer, the second layer, and the third layer include edge areas that have depressions." Applicant submits that Henry does not teach that the layers of a semiconductor component only have depressions in an internal area and do not have depressions in edge areas. One portion of Henry relied on by the Examiner pertains to forming diodes by using saw kerfs that penetrate the internal layer and sawing the wafer into pieces. Page 1, line 36 to Page, line 5. The diodes described by Henry are configured to include depressions not only in an internal area but also at edge areas. See Figure 3.

Therefore, in view of this discussion, Applicant submits that claim 16 is patentable over Henry.

Claims 9, 10 and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Henry in view of United States Patent No. 4,220,963 to Rummenik ("Rummenik").

Claim 9, as amended, recites "introducing depressions into a wafer of a first conductivity type", and "dicing the wafer into individual chips in such a way that each chip includes at least one of the depressions in an internal area thereof but not in any edge area thereof." Applicant submits that neither Henry nor Rummenik

teaches that individual chips with depressions only in an internal area thereof but not in any edge areas thereof. As discussed above with the § 102(b) rejection, Henry pertains to forming diodes by using saw kerfs that penetrate the internal layer and sawing the wafer into pieces. Page 1, line 36, to page, line 5. The diodes described by Henry are configured to include depressions not only in an internal area, but also at edge areas. Figure 3. Additionally, Rummenik states that “[t]he completed device may then have its edges beveled”. Col. 3, lines 16-17. The diode of Rummenik includes a beveled edge that forms an edge area with a depression.

Therefore, in view of this discussion, Applicant submits that claim 9 is patentable over the combination of Henry and Rummenik. Claims 10 and 12-15 depend from claim 9. Accordingly, claims 10 and 12-15 are not rendered obvious for at least the reasons given for the allowability of claim 9.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Henry in view of Rummenik and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,985,067 to Schmid et al. (“Schmid”) or alternatively over Henry in view of Rummenik.

Claim 11 depends on claim 9. Consequently, all claim limitations of claim 9 of the present application that Henry, Rummenik, and Schmid do not teach or suggest (as discussed above in connection with the § 102(b) rejection and the § 103(a) rejection) are also not taught or suggested with respect to claim 11 of the present application. Neither Henry, Rummenik, nor Schmid teaches “introducing depressions into a wafer of a first conductivity type”, or “dicing the wafer into individual chips in such a way that each chip includes at least one of the depressions in an internal area thereof but not in any edge area thereof.” Accordingly, claim 11 is not rendered obvious for at least the reasons given for allowability of claim 9.

In view of all of the above, it is believed that the rejections of claims 9-16 have been obviated, and that all of claims 9-16 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

By: *LB Magee (Reg. No. 44,172)*

Dated: 1/30/04

By: *Rich L. Mayer*

Richard L. Mayer
Reg. No. 22,490

One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200